UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Uncensored News from Europe's Hot Spots - - - - - - - - *Devere Allen*

The Scapegoat in the Modern World - - - - - - - - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

Ridding Churches of Their "Slave Galleries" - - - - - - - - *Eliot White*

The American Constitution and Liberalism - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 4, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3

ARTICLES—
Uncensored News from Europe's Hot Spots—DEVERE ALLEN ... 6
The Scapegoat in the Modern World—STANTON A. COBLENTZ .. 7
Ridding Churches of Their "Slave Galleries"—ELIOT WHITE 10
The American Constitution and Liberalism—VICTOR S. YARROS .. 12

POETRY—
The Silver Thread—HELEN KIMBERLY MCELHONE 5

THE STUDY TABLE—
Wells' Latest—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 13
New Testament Theologies—C. A. HAWLEY 14

CORRESPONDENCE—
The W.P.A. Theatre—BLANCHE WATSON 15
The Reverend Mr. Eddy Replies—A. L. EDDY 15
Irrelevant Foreign Tags and Quarrels—VICTOR S. YARROS 16

THE FIELD—
Labor Sunday Message, 1939—*Zions Herald* 2
Food for Thought 16

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Labor Sunday Message, 1939

Issued by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, through its Department of the Church and Social Service.

The recent world conference of the churches held at Madras, India, to consider their missionary task issued to the world a stirring call to fellowship and Christian brotherhood. It is appropriate that the church should speak this word at a time of conflict and confusion. In critical hours of human history, God has spoken through His church and redirected the course of human affairs. Once again the church speaks to our age of transition and crisis and lifts up the practice of Christian brotherhood as a commanding ideal above the warring and conflicting ideologies of the hour.

The most menacing evil from which the world is suffering today is lack of brotherhood. This lack has been conspicuous in the relations between race and race, nation and nation, employer and worker. On Labor Sunday our attention is especially directed to the area of our industrial and economic life. It is encouraging indeed that a new spirit of understanding and coöperation is becoming apparent between many employers and organized labor. Widespread recognition of labor unions, the acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining, and the regulation of hours and fair labor standards now pave the way for more constructive and intelligent coöperation in American industry.

The trend toward industry-wide organization of employers for collective agreements with organized labor, covering whole industries, offers hope of the more stabilized labor relations and fewer strikes which characterize British and Swedish industry. We heartily commend the efforts of farsighted American employers toward this end and earnestly hope that such trends may be strengthened.

But today there are other areas of misunderstanding and strife to which we wish to call attention.

At the very time when the interests of workers require coöperation and unity, we see organized labor unable to agree within its own ranks. We would express the hope that the conflict between organizations of labor may be resolved, and a genuine unity among all the representatives of labor be realized.

There is, however, another area to which the church has in the past given little attention—namely, that of the relation between the industrial workers and farmers. Because of the lack of personal acquaintance and contacts between these groups, there exists a widespread lack of understanding of each other's just needs and objectives. Prejudice and even bitterness feed on ignorance of these groups concerning each other. Yet farmers and industrial workers have much in common. Both cherish the principle of democracy in organization. Many farmers seek, through their farm organizations, the same essential democratic

(*Continued on page* 16)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1939 No. 1

THE VOICE OF MAN

The spring of virtuous action is the social instinct, which is set to work by the practice of comradeship.

The union of men in a common effort for a common object, this is and always has been the true school of character.

—*W. K. Clifford*

RUSSIA JOINS GERMANY

The Russo-German non-aggression pact is announced on this very day when our Editorials must be ready for the printer. In the confusion of the moment, we can think of only two things. First, with a kind of grim and terrible satisfaction, that we announced months ago in these columns that an alliance between Stalin and Hitler was one of the very good possibilities, if not probabilities, of the future! This prophecy was born of our utter disillusionment as to Russia at the time of the "purges," to say nothing of our general distrust and contempt for all governments in their diplomatic actions. Secondly, there are our Communist friends and sympathizers—how we pity them! For years they have been shouting to high heaven that Fascism (Naziism) is the supreme menace, and that we must all make a united front with Communism against it. Now, at the quick order from Moscow, they must defend Fascism and join a united front with Hitler. What a prospect! Meanwhile, events sweep on with whirlwind fury, and we must reserve other comment for our next issue.

LABOR DAY

We frequently think of Labor Day as the one truest and finest holiday on the annual calendar. There is a genuineness about it that seems lacking in more than one of the other national occasions. New Year's Day, for example, is an annual debauch, but feebly redeemed by the religious services which are offered in reverent spirit by the churches. Memorial Day, in spite of every endeavor to make it otherwise, is a sanctification of war and a glorification of the soldier, and if we had our way it would be removed from the calendar. The Fourth of July is an orgy of cheap patriotism, made horrible by senseless din and needless deaths. Armistice Day, in much of its observance, is a day of mourning and thus does something to counterbalance Memorial Day; but, even so, it keeps alive a memory that might far better be forgotten. Thanksgiving Day has lost all too much of its original religious character, and, outside of New England at least, is mostly a day of sports, feasting, and after-dinner sleeping. As for Christmas, it is still made holy by many a church and many a home, but its capture by the commercial interests is a dreadful thing to contemplate (see Editorial following!). Of all our holidays, we see only the famous birthdays—Washington's, Lincoln's, Columbus'—as still untainted, and thus fit to be matched with Labor Day, which seems to us to be the finest of them all. Labor Day is a celebration and a sanctification of work and of the workers. It is commemorated by parades which have no touch of militarism, and by meetings which are not marred by jingoistic patriotic oratory. It marks the climax and close of the out-of-doors vacation season, and thus glorifies rest and recreation as the accompaniment and condition of healthful toil. If class feeling sometimes intrudes upon the day, it is because labor is not wholly free nor our society wholly democratic—which means that the holiday is not merely a celebration of victories won, but a dedication as well to battles not yet won. We like Labor Day! We feel in it the march of progress, the lift of liberty, the pulse of brotherhood, and the promise of the commonwealth of man. If Sunday is the day which the Lord hath made, this is the day which humanity hath made. We think the one as holy as the other!

A NEW THANKSGIVING DAY

The furious discussion stirred up by the President's changing of Thanksgiving Day from November 30th to November 23rd seems to us altogether disproportionate to the offense alleged. We understand the Plymouth Selectmen to whom this holiday is as sacred, though by no means as old, as the Rock itself. We sympathize with the football managers and coaches whose schedules are all mixed up. (Ours is a mess, too!) We mourn for the millions of turkeys whose lives are wantonly shortened by an entire week. But there are compensations! Think of what the President has generously done for all his enemies, in giving them one more chance to sputter spitefully at him! Consider the priceless boon which he has conferred upon the cartoonists, columnists, editorialists, and jokesmiths throughout the land! If any group in the country will have reason for heartfelt thanksgiving this year, it is this hard-pressed and hard-working journalistic tribe.

And then, business—ah, *business!* Look at what the President has bountifully and benevolently done for this pampered pet of our profit-making industrial system! But—what *has* he done? It is at just this point that our faith grows dim. He has extended the Christmas shopping season a week, no doubt about that! This will lift a bit the pressure of the season on distracted and exhausted employees—and for this, much thanks! But will it pour any such flood of gold into commercial coffers as manufacturers and retailers now contemplate? We can't see it at all! People buy just so much for Christmas, and that's the end of it. There's the sled for Johnny, and the skates for Gwendolyn, and the tie and socks for Dad, and the scarf for Aunt Susan, and the handkerchiefs and perfumery for the cousins, and "three dozen Christmas cards, please—I've got the list of those who sent me last year!" These goods may be bought in three or in four weeks, but what's the difference in actual trade? All of which stirs us up at last, for this whole Christmas shopping orgy has long been to us a disgusting thing. What is Christmas anyway—a religious holyday or a commercial holiday—a tribute to Christ or to Mammon? Whether Thanksgiving comes on the 30th or 23rd, we don't much care. But we hate to see Thanksgiving added to Christmas for the prostitution of money-making.

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

As the Jewish New Year 5700, Rosh Hashonoh, comes to hand this month, Israel looks upon a crisis of persecution and outlawry as dreadful as any which her people have faced in years gone by. This hour seems to be marked by an accumulation of indignity, suffering and despair almost unparalleled in the experience of the most sorely stricken and most patiently heroic group in human history. But Israel is being not only terribly hurt in this ghastly time, but also greatly helped. Never hitherto, when Jews were butchered and exiled, has such a tide of compassion flowed to them from out the hearts of men. Christians, many times themselves the cruel persecutors, are now the understanding friends of Jewry. The voices of countless Catholics and Protestants are being lifted today in denunciation and protest, and their hands extended in sympathy and comfort. Furthermore, the Jews of the world stand not alone in the horror of their woe. Their sufferings are not so much their own as the common sufferings of great masses of humankind. Their crisis is a crisis not merely of Israel, but of democracy, freedom, and religion. The fate of the Jews in Germany and Italy and elsewhere, in other words, is the fate of our whole western civilization. If the Jews are destroyed, we are all destroyed; if the Jews are saved, it is because we are all saved together from this latest onslaught of barbarism. What we see in this modern age is what has never been seen before in Christendom—an identity of Israel with mankind. In earlier times the Jew has been driven apart in naked agony and grief, with no one to bear him company. Today he stands as one of the great host of humankind, battling in a single army against a single enemy for the preservation of all we hold dear together. Anti-Semitism in our time is a dreadful menace, but it is a menace not against the Jews merely, but against us all—a part of the attack of brute savagery upon the citadels of man's culture and the altars of his faith. As surely as Israel's cause is the cause of all free men, so surely will it be won in terms at last of universal brotherhood. Let this New Year, therefore, be an occasion of hope as well as patience, of confidence as well as courage, for the Kingdom of God is at hand.

THIS MYSTERIOUS DEMOCRACY!

Where is this democracy that everybody says we must help to save in Europe? Not in Germany, or Italy, or Spain, or Russia, surely! Nor does it seem to be very conspicuous in other nations. Thus, there is not a vestige of it in Poland, which is ruled by a dictator as absolute as Hitler, and incidentally as hateful of the Jews. There is none of it in Roumania, which stands firm with Britain to stop the Nazis. Greece, another British ally, groans under the tyrannical rule of General Metaxas. Turkey knows no more freedom under Kemal's successor than it did under the sultans. France has dismissed its Parliament, cancelled its elections, and is ruled by the arbitrary decrees of Daladier and his cabinet. England, a democracy at home ruled nonetheless by an aristocratic property-owning class, is an autocratic empire in India and other colonies abroad. Democracy? There *is* none in Europe, except in such countries as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Holland, Switzerland—and these are just the countries which do not count in the present European situation. Yet, forsooth, we are told and asked to believe that Britain's alliance of encircling nations against the Berlin-Rome Axis is in the interests of democracy, and that our own country should join, or at least help, this alliance to make the world safe for democracy once more! This is bunk as egregious as anything that ever came out of the last war. Agreed that, culturally and socially, France and England are much nearer to us than Germany and Italy—a fact, by the way, which is *not* true of Hungary, Poland, Roumania, Greece, and Turkey!—it still remains a fact that, in essence, there is no democratic issue involved in this present European alignment at all. It's a struggle not over democracy, but over the existing international *status quo.* Britain and France, in their own imperial interest, want to maintain this *status quo.* But if anything is plainer than a nose on the human face it is that neither Europe, nor yet the world, can be at peace nor even survive if this *status quo* is maintained. It *must* be changed, as that great Englishman, Sir Arthur Salter, has shown in his recent book, if the world is to be held together.

So let us drop this democracy talk, and get down to the real issue. What are we going to *do* about reorganizing the world?

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

The *Christian Leader* uncovered a hornet's nest this summer when its Editor, the wise and ever amiable John Van Schaick, Jr., wrote an Editorial in criticism and rejection of the Townsend Plan. Letters of indignation, protest, and denunciation came pouring in. Subscriptions were cancelled in furious resentment. It was a grand shenanigan (if that's the word!), in which only the much-abused Editor kept his head. Patiently, week after week, he filled his correspondence columns with letters pointing out his weaknesses of mind and cruelties of heart, and with unfailing good temper and much courage he held his ground. It was an admirable exhibition on the Editor's side, though not on the other side, of the true liberal spirit at work in the field of free discussion. What most of Mr. Van Schaick's critics seemed quite to miss was the all-important point that pension relief for the aged is one thing, and the precise program of relief embodied in the Townsend Plan is something else again. The Townsend partisans seemed obsessed with the idea that the Plan was some kind of an infallibly revealed solution of the old-age problem, and any criticism of it a heresy not to be tolerated for a moment. It was to us a rather frightening spectacle to see perfectly good Universalists writing about a social scheme in exactly the spirit of the old-time religious orthodoxies in the days of persecution. Free thought, the right of private judgment, the exercise of open and critical discussion were not to be endured, but on the contrary ruthlessly punished! And along with this, of course, went the charge that rejection of the Townsend Plan meant repudiation of the whole idea of taking care of the old and infirm by general social action. Now, let's have this clear! All intelligent and right-minded persons, the Editor of the *Christian Leader* included, are heartily in favor of security for the older members of society. But a lot of intelligent and right-minded persons believe, for very good reasons, that the Townsend Plan is practically unworkable, ethically indefensible, in general and in particular a scheme of financial, mental, and moral bankruptcy, and they propose to say so as long as free thought and free speech prevail. If this be treason, make the most of it!

AN INTERESTING MORAL QUESTION

In H. G. Wells' *The Holy Terror,* we read the story of a world dictator, Rud, who out of the ruin of the next war emerges as the master of mankind, just as Hitler emerged out of the ruin of the last war as the master of Germany. In the hour of his triumph, Rud was overwhelmed with adulation, and "his fan mail," says Wells, "attained astronomical dimensions." To meet this, Rud's office created a huge staff of secretaries to answer letters. Then, writes Wells (page 347): "Thirp [an associate of Rud] collected a half-dozen convicted but now reformed forgers who could do the most brilliant variations of Rud's signatures."

It chances that, at the same time we were reading Wells' book, we were reading also Raymond Moley's articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* describing his relationship with President Roosevelt. In the article about the campaign for election in 1932, Moley tells of the candidate's overwhelming correspondence, and how secretaries were employed not only to write Roosevelt's letters in reply, but also to imitate his signature. Moley surmises the coming of a time when the autograph market will be flooded with Roosevelt letters, most of them bearing signatures which are spurious. (It should be added that this practice was in due time discontinued!) Now, what are the ethics of this business? Wells implies that forgery is involved, yet intimates no feeling of reprobation. Moley seems amused rather than otherwise by the deception practiced upon thousands of simple folk now cherishing, we imagine, "a letter signed by the President!" Are we a fanatic if we confess that we think that a moral question is involved here, to the extent at least that a secretary's letter should be signed by a secretary, and that, in the case of personal epistolatory correspondence, apart from circular letters, appeals, announcements, and what not, a man's signature should never be signed by another except without imitation and with the secretary's initials appended. We feel about this as we do about "ghost" speeches—i. e., addresses by public men written not by themselves but by secretaries or publicity experts. After all, there *is* such a thing as honesty, though it seems largely to have vanished from the modern world.

The Silver Thread

When, in the deepest hours of the dark,
Night blinds us to the color and the line
Of some familiar room, and leaves it stark
And void; mere memory must then define
The beauty and the shapes night can erase,
And lead our groping fingers, without sight,
To touch the tiny spot that can replace
Familiar forms, and flood the room with light.

Would it be vain imagination, then,
To deem that if entire darkness fall
Upon the sleeping souls of weary men,
With beauty still alive behind the pall,
That we might grope and find the igniting spark
Within some silvery thread, and light the dark?

HELEN KIMBERLY MCELHONE.

Uncensored News from Europe's Hot Spots*

DEVERE ALLEN

[Nofrontier News Service]

Madrid. Stories reaching the outside world of cruelties under the Franco regime, and of great disorganization, are mainly true. The camps in which prisoners are confined—when they have not been executed—are fearsome; in cases where women have been permitted to return to Spain to visit these camps and see their husbands, it has been extremely hard for the women to get away again to France, so hard-boiled is the attitude of the authorities.

A woman eighty years of age was ordered to surrender her son, who was suspected of Republican sympathies. When she was unable to do so within the prescribed time of twenty-four hours, she was summarily taken out and shot.

Production has almost ceased, and food is terribly scarce. The government is without money, without food, without real capacity as yet to organize the country. Agriculture is nearly everywhere in a desperate condition. The best industrial plants were used to make munitions and have not yet been turned over into productive enterprise.

Many times the "official searches" for political antagonists are carried out chiefly in the hope of finding food or valuables which can be confiscated, particularly the former. Even those civil servants known to be most loyal to Franco are suffering from want of food.

Those dead from combat and other causes associated with the war number almost 2,000,000 of the 22,000,000 in the country, and these were mainly between 17 and 40 years of age; thus half the young men are dead.

The present government is in control of the aristocratic elements, and these alone have enough to eat.

London. All Europe will continue for some time to ring with phrases of blame—with an occasional undertone of praise—for the "indiscretion" of the British Minister, R. M. Hudson, in suggesting to Herr Wohltat, German representative, that a huge loan might be made to Germany to rehabilitate the country on a basis of disarmament. This proposal received widespread publicity in the United States, of course; and, as here, much speculation regarding the degree to which Mr. Hudson was speaking as an individual and as a mouthpiece of the British government. Skepticism of Mr. Chamberlain's denial that the government knew anything about it is more than justified—it may positively be stated that the government did know about it and that Mr. Hudson himself has not been backward in making this fact known to his friends.

In circles hostile to appeasement, Mr. Hudson has been bitterly assailed for his part in making peaceable advances to the Nazis. Pages and pages of invective have been written, particularly in the press of the Left. It probably has not been made clear in America that whatever may be thought of Mr. Hudson for the difficult task of sending up a trial balloon for which he was selected, he has never had previously the repute of being pro-Nazi. On the contrary, he has been so harsh and unsparingly critical of Nazi policy that he has more than once been at loggerheads with the extreme conservatives of the Tory party.

Peace-minded Britains who do not want the militarism at home that is being engendered by the ridiculously phrased "peace front," and who are still opposed to appeasement which fosters Fascism, point out that the trouble with the Chamberlain formula of carrying water on both shoulders, and seeking "peace through strength" is that it leaves no truly pacific alternative. Either it must lead to war, or a settlement which makes permanent all the worst features of Munich. On the other hand, a true appeasement policy would be international in scope and control, with many nations participating in the scrutiny of disarmament at once in Germany, Italy, France, and Britain, and with a program of public works that would avert the economic slump expected to accompany disarmament and work toward a better deal for colonial populations now kicked about in the bickering for imperial prestige.

Prague. Profound changes in the attitude of Czechs can be noted as they have been swept along by events through confidence in military power to protect the country, to the disbanding of their armed forces, and to the ultimate conquest of their land by Hitlerism. It must not be supposed that even in the crisis of September, 1938, there was universal trust in arms. There were a few cases, at least, of open war resistance when the Czech army mobilized. It speaks well for the Czech authorities of that day that these men were not treated with any particular harshness but were recognized as sincere. But war resistance under present conditions is neither preached nor practiced, it seems so fantastic to the most peace-minded.

The Czechs, however, are already coming back to an interest in cultural values and labor questions which they had subjugated for a time to the demands of armed might. Not a majority, but surprisingly many, are coming to see that what has happened came less out of a clear sky than from policies embarked upon long ago and which could never have produced a happy outcome. Thousands of Czechs have completely lost interest in war or violence as a means of ultimate deliverance, though they are no less determined to achieve it. When the first shock came, together with the marching in of Nazi ideas as well as Nazi feet, there was a natural reaction which led to the growth, among certain sections of the Czech people, of anti-Semitism and of Fascism. Even this is receding as perspective lengthens, and more and more individuals are venturing to assert greater sympathy for the Jews.

Recently all British committees for work on behalf of refugees were compelled to close down. Only small groups of Czechs and others are now permitted to operate, and entirely for children. The one noteworthy exception is the work of the Quakers, which is going on constructively.

A particularly clever form of censorship is being used—printers are compelled to take out censored ma-

*In a covering letter, Mr. Allen writes: "I vouch for the accuracy of each and every one personally, but in order to prevent serious consequences to persons from whom this information is derived, you will have to trust me. I have used date lines from four different sections from which the news items have been sent or brought to me directly, completely without censorship." Mr. Allen is in Europe for a prolonged stay, and this is the first of a series of his newsletters. —*Editor.*

terial while the matter is still in type, and then rearrange the type so that when the publications appear, the censored portions are not blacked out as at one time, but give no indication that they have been removed. The public is therefore unaware of what the censor has done or that anything has been missed.

Berlin. Berlin's great black-out, long planned and much heralded by the Nazi press as a great forthcoming demonstration of efficiency, was a "flop." This will explain the sudden choking off of the drill, actually long before dawn, when it was expected to continue for two more nights. News of the sudden cancellation of orders was permitted to go out, of course, at the time, and the whole world has speculated on the reasons behind this right-about-face.

The great "show" was pretty poor. On the night of July 27th, at the very moment when the black-out was expected to be at its blackest, the lights of automobiles were clearly discernible from good points of observation in the town, as cars sped merrily along the suburban highways in disregard of instructions. Even Nazis in uniform were heard openly, here and there, bluntly laughing in scorn at the folly of such "protection." As always at dark, except on foggy nights, in northern Europe, the city stood clearly silhouetted against the sky.

As shown by a report made months ago by a committee of Danish experts appointed to investigate the whole question of black-outs, these are almost completely useless. Their only value in war is to cover up certain vital centers, etc., and to make it inevitable that cruising bombers of an enemy must indiscriminately dump their loads of bombs amid civilians, artistic buildings, historic monuments, and cultural centers, as well as "military objectives" piously put forward as the justification for night air raids. In not one single nation where these black-outs have been tried has anything of much military value been gained, but they are a useful stimulus to fear and consequently to arms appropriations.

The Scapegoat in the Modern World

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

There was a custom of the ancient Hebrews which required that every year, on the Day of Atonement, the High Priest should place his hands on the head of a goat and confess to it the misdeeds of his people. By this means the sins were transferred to the animal, which, laden with its vicarious transgressions, was driven into the wilderness, and so relieved the Children of Israel of the burden of their guilt. This curious and very simple means of washing clean the moral slate was, however, not confined to the sons of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for though it has the distinction of having given us the word "scapegoat," it represents but one variation of a custom which has been well-nigh universal among savage and partially civilized tribes. Any other beast or bird chosen by tradition would do as well as a goat; indeed, a member of the *genus homo* was often considered the appropriate victim. Among the early Japanese, it was a horse which was the agent of purification, and bore away all foulness to be washed off in the sea; among certain western Himalayan peoples, according to Frazer's *Golden Bough,* it is a dog that is the public benefactor, and that pays for the general iniquities by being stoned or beaten to death; while in other regions monkeys, rats, and other animals are disembowelled or crucified to atone for human wrongdoing.

But the most striking application of the scapegoat idea occurs when it is a man or woman that pays the penalty. Thus in ancient Athens the stroke of wrath fell upon some particularly ugly member of the community, who was treated ceremonially for his high role, and then driven from the city, and (theoretically) burned alive. In the colony of Massilia, the slaying was more than theoretical; a criminal, having been publicly kept for a year, paid with his life not so much for his own offenses as for those of his fellow citizens. On the same plane of magic were the customs of certain Niger tribes, who annually purged themselves of sin by the sacrifice of two human beings purchased by public subscription; while certain west African aborigines chose an *Oluwo* for the sacrifice, fed him well for a period and then led him out so that the people might run forth, lay hands on him, and so transfer their sins to him—after which he was beheaded.

Other examples might be offered *ad nauseam*—from that of the Albanians who engaged a spear-thrower to slay the "sacred slaves" at the end of each year, to that of the Siamese who flung dirt upon a dissolute and broken-down woman and excluded her from the city. But, whatever the differences in detail, all these cases exemplify the same theory. They all illustrate the primitive belief that it is possible, by magical means, to drive off evil forces; and that some being not originally contaminated, whether a rat or a man, may be made the physical agency of purification. To a certain extent, they spring from the same state of mind as that of the boy who, beaten by his father, kicks the cat in order to soothe his feelings; and in the main their psychology is that of the man who would "make the other fellow pay" the debts he has contracted. But, beyond this, they are possible only because of a deep-seated belief in the efficacy of supernatural means to salvation.

All this may seem, of course, rather remote from the affairs of today—a mere matter of anthropology and history which has no interest other than that of strangeness and remoteness. Actually, however, it is of vital importance in the modern world—as vital as ever it was to any fire-worshipping savage who burnt a fellow being in order to drive off the demons of disease. For the scapegoat is not one with the sea-serpent and the Centaur. He is not merely a creature of a dim and half mythical past. He is a present-day reality. He has been with us throughout all the ages of the world, and was never more vigorously alive than in the twentieth century. True, he has taken on new forms and apparel, but these do not alter his essential nature; in some respects, they only enhance it. And such is his in-

fluence over the minds of great leaders and obedient masses that he has radically affected the life of our generation—affected it so radically, in fact, that if one would reach an understanding of contemporary problems one must recognize the place of the scapegoat.

But before turning to our own age, it may be profitable to indulge in a brief retrospect. Merely in passing, we may note how the scapegoat has flourished amid the altering forms and institutions of civilization. Disguised as a heretic, he has suffered the ire and the bonfires of the Inquisition. Disguised as a witch, he has heard the imprecations of shuddering thousands, and felt the hangman's rope and the shrivelling brand. Disguised as an Infidel, he has known the lances and arrows of Crusading ardor. Disguised as an "untouchable," he has been forbidden access to the wells and temples of the Hindu upper castes. Disguised as a Calvinist, a Huguenot, a Puritan, a Jew, or a whatnot, he has been scorched by the fury of religious riots and wars. Disguised as a Jacobin or a "republican," he has been the target of rulers and royalist armies in the days following the French Revolution. Disguised as an atheist or a "free thinker," he has been ostracized; disguised as a Galileo, a Roger Bacon, a Giordano Bruno, he has been imprisoned, burned, or threatened with the stake. Disguised as an "abolitionist" in our own pre-Civil War days, he has been in danger in certain districts of being reviled and attacked by mobs; disguised as a noble or a priest in Russia of revolutionary times, he has suffered for the sins of generations. Never, in any of these cases, was he given the name of scapegoat; rarely has it been realized, except perhaps subconsciously, that he was a scapegoat at all; but always he has been made to suffer for the evils piled upon his shoulders by the imagination or the peculiar beliefs of his persecutors, who felt in a sense that they purged themselves by heaping punishments upon his shoulders.

In certain instances, the scapegoat has been the victim of the deliberate action of the law, which has sought to "make an example" of a particular offender, even though his crimes were no more serious than those of other individuals. On other occasions, it is to be feared, the law has been perverted to serve the prejudices or passions of a group—as in the notorious Mooney case in California, when a man admitted to have been convicted on perjured evidence was made the scapegoat of anti-labor agitation and of popular resentment, and remained in prison for more than a score of years. But, in a majority of cases, the scapegoat has not been the target of anything legal; rather, he has been the butt of the mob, a football to be kicked and pummeled by the unleashed rabble. This has been cryingly true in the lynchings that have been scarlet spots in the history of the South; the prejudice against the black man, breaking out with spasmodic violence, has again and again caused some offender or supposed offender to be hanged or burned—and, by casting out the evil presumed to exist within such a scapegoat, has enabled the white population for a time to satisfy its savage passions. And much the same may be said of the anti-Chinese demonstrations which broke out on the Pacific Coast in the seventies and eighties, and in which murder, incendiarism, and riot demanded many an unoffending Oriental as the scapegoat of white hostility.

Even when motivated by a certain degree of justice and reason, a crowd setting out to cure some particular evil will almost invariably pick a scapegoat. By way of evidence, let me cite an example from early California history. In 1851 the first Vigilance Committee of San Francisco was established by a group of citizens disgusted with the inability of the law to check the wave of arson, robbery, and murder. Having organized itself as a secret society, with a constitution and duly elected officers, it set out to chastise crime. The first criminal it apprended was one John Jenkins, a man of unsavory reputation, who was caught in the act of stealing a portable safe. Doubtless this was a serious offense; nevertheless, in San Francisco of those early days, when men were shot to death as they went about their business or were waylaid by thugs, robbed and pitched into the bay, the crime of Jenkins was after all a second-rate affair. No matter!—he had been caught, and would serve as well as any other scapegoat! And so, after a swift trial, the march to the gallows began; and while the police looked on without attempting resistance, the life of the unfortunate man was ended with a rope. Much as when the members of a savage community purify themselves by offering up a dog or a human scapegoat, so the citizens of San Francisco had rid themselves of evil in the person of John Jenkins.

Turning to more recent events, we will find that the scapegoat has appeared in a variety of forms. We have called him by a number of names, usually conveying a certain degree of opprobrium, for example, "Red," "Radical," "Bolshevik," and "Communist." It is the latter term which has been employed most frequently and to most devastating effect: let a man be in the least degree unconventional in his views, let him advocate a change in the electoral laws or a liberalizing of our attitude toward labor or toward immigration, and that blasting charge "Communist!" will be hurled in his face like a stick of dynamite. Accordingly, the Communist and the so-called Communist (it does not matter which, since both are grouped together) are made the scapegoats of our resentment, as if through them our sins can be wafted off into the wilderness. A John Strachey is forbidden permission to enter the United States on a lecture tour, though few would seriously contend that his presence would endanger our life and institutions; a Harry Bridges, Pacific Coast labor leader is branded "Communist" by his enemies, in order that he may bear off the evils of labor agitation into the wilds of his native Australia; a Mayor Hague uses the term "Communist" by way of focusing prejudice against all who happen to disapprove of his political views or methods, and by this means seeks to justify the mob-attacks and the deportations. Meantime, great nations are not superior to the same tactics: "Communist! Communist! Communist!" cry Germany, Italy, and Japan, while they flaunt their Fascist banners and seek to make of Soviet Russia the scapegoat of world antagonism.

But the most characteristic and the most sinister recent manifestation of the scapegoat psychology has occurred in connection with treatment of minority populations. It is as if we had suddenly been beset by some demon-spirit from the ancient world; as if we had been wooed back to a belief in the black magic of the Middle Ages, and were again seeking some enchantment, some supernatural means of purification, some miraculous way of heaping our accumulated ills upon the shoulders of scapegoats and driving them off into the wasteland. The Russians of a few years ago, when they savagely persecuted the well-to-do-peasants or

"kulaks" and starved, deported, or slew these victims of revolutionary ire, may have thought that they were acting soberly beneath the spur of economic compulsion; but actually they were making scapegoats of the kulaks, were venting upon them the pent-up wrath which they felt at all the wrongs they had endured from the possessing classes, and in the sufferings of this proscribed group they were trying to wash away the iniquities of generations. Something to the same effect may be said of the attacks upon churches in both Russia and Spain —attacks wherein particular priests or nuns, probably in most cases personally unoffending, were made the scapegoats of popular rage against the wrongs of which the religious institutions as a whole had become the symbols.

It is, however, to modern Germany—Germany, supposedly one of the capitals of world culture—that one must turn to see the scapegoat decked in all his trappings of ancient magic and medieval superstition. There, beneath the clubs and lashes of racial persecution, walks the lamed and mutilated victim upon whose head every evil imagined or real has been thrust. To the anthropologist, the spectacle of the recent pogroms may be of interest, even though to the humanitarian they are perhaps the most disheartening events of modern history. They offer us the scapegoat at a new stage of development; they show that that particular form of human sacrifice induced by the scapegoat idea has now reached an apogee inconceivable to the primitive worshipper who slew an old man or a child in order that his tribe might be spared the wrath of the gods.

Individuals, or even groups or classes of individuals, are not the targets of the new Teutonic devil-exorcisers; a whole race, a whole people, numbering hundreds of thousands of souls, has been chosen as the scapegoat. In the Jews, according to the Nazi mythology, all evil inheres; every member of the Hebrew race, though his blood be three-fourth "Aryan," shares in the original contamination; every member of the Hebrew race is a source of disturbance, a bearer of ill, though he be an Einstein or a Freud; consequently, this people must be treated as if beyond the pale of humanity. This doctrine, as applied to smaller groups and castes, is by no means new; but invoked almost at a moment's notice by a country formerly in the forefront of civilization and made to apply indiscriminately to an entire people, it is something unparalleled since the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492—and cannot find an analogy even in the latter event, in which religion rather than race was made the basis of the persecution. Doubtless Hitler and his cohorts do not realize the fact, but they have brought the scapegoat into the modern world in a form so immense and with features so monstrous as to mark a new stage in the development of this ancient institution.

To a considerable extent, it is possible to trace the subconscious psychology behind the blast of persecution. In part, it is the psychology of jealousy and rage: the jealousy and rage of men who have seen themselves outdone in the race of intelligence and of acquisition—as so many German "Aryans" have been outdone by German Jews. In part it is the psychology of hordes who, under vast governmental and military restraint, have seen the barriers to action suddenly broken down and are eager to vent their cooped-up fury upon any permitted victim. In part, again, it is the psychology of a country brutalized by war and the memory of war; and in part it is the mere psychology of the schoolyard bully, and of the freshman-hazing college sophomore. But beyond all this—and here is the truly sinister, the diabolical, the boundlessly menacing aspect of the case—it is a deliberately magnified and aggravated version of the psychology of the scapegoat-seeking savage.

The untutored native of the Himalayan foothills or of the African jungle, not having enjoyed the advantages of civilization, is goaded by no vast national organization when he seeks some human victim to bear away his sins. He has no Fuehrer to direct him, no Minister of Propaganda to sift the contents of his mind, no Storm Troopers to perform acts of butchery before his eyes, no concentration camps where the practice of sadism may flourish unrebuked. When he beats or murders a scapegoat, he does it in a small-scale and unorganized manner—and thereby proves his inferiority to the modern practitioners of the craft. For it has remained for Hitler and his followers to introduce methods of mass production into the creation of scapegoats; it has remained for them to organize the industry on an official and nation-wide basis. Truly, the sins of the German people must he heavy, and countless as the sea-sands, else they would not require so many scapegoats to carry off the evil!

And truly the German people, blinded by the National Socialist ideology, do not realize how they have been plunging back, back, back to the jungle—back, back, back to a point beneath anything the jungle has ever known. For the scapegoat idea is the antithesis of all civilized concepts; and, to the extent to which they have been seduced by this idea, the Germans have deserted civilization. At one sad stroke they have swept away the advances of centuries and have returned, apparently without realizing it, to a prehistoric world of human sacrifice. Will their methods and practices be spread to an earth made desolate by resurrected savagery? Or will they awaken from their delirium, and realize that in the long run he who makes a scapegoat of another makes a scapegoat of himself? Will they perceive that the debasement of humanity, and of all humane standards, must in the end exact a dire tribute of the persecutors? Or will they proceed in their anti-racial, anti-religious, anti-civilized crusade until even countries outside the Fascist orbit have been contaminated with the microbes of their mad ardor?

This is a question not outdistanced in importance by any confronting the modern world; for upon its solution depends something more than a matter of scapegoats or no scapegoats. What is at issue, in fact, is whether the civilization and the humane values which we have been building for centuries will have a chance for survival, or whether we are to doff the mask of culture and return to the ancient wilderness of sorcery, incantations, and scapegoat-slaying witch-doctors.

What can I do? I can talk out when others are silent. I can say love when others say hate. I can say every man when others say one man. I can try events by a hard test when others try them by easy tests. I can give life big meanings when others give life little meanings.

What can I do? I can give myself to life when other men refuse themselves to life.

—*Chants Communal*
Horace Traubel, alt.

Ridding Churches of Their "Slave Galleries"

ELIOT WHITE*

There are shown to visitors at All Saints' Episcopal Church, on Henry Street, New York City, what are supposed to constitute a unique historical feature of its interior—two "slave galleries." A former rector of the parish wrote, in an article in the *Christian Century:*

> It is interesting to mention that this All Saints' Church, where no color line exists today, dates back to 1827, to a day when slavery was legal in this State, and that our building has in it two slave-galleries, a reminder of a different attitude toward our colored brethren. It is the only church in the vicinity with slave-galleries today.

So in the days when negro slavery was upheld by much of the churchly sentiment "before the war," the masters and their human property could attend this place of worship together, with the owned ones sitting in their allotted galleries well apart from their owners.

But what should be most interesting about this feature, to an ecclesiastical organization which deplores (in the words of one of the best-known bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church), "the absence of the so-called masses" from religious services, is that the peculiar and rare place of worship today is one not with, but *without,* a slave gallery.

The rector of All Saints', Manhattan, was too optimistic in his belief that his edifice "is the only church in the vicinity with slave-galleries today." The exceptional church edifices of any denomination are those to which the workers who produce the world's wealth hold title, and support their services with no dependence whatever upon rich and charitable exploiters. For these happily circumstanced congregations alone (and it is a matter of thankfulness that there are a few, the most notable in this writer's estimation being the Community Church of New York City), there is no need of slave galleries; because no member of those few congregations is an economic or industrial master, which means, for all essential purposes, *owner* of any other member.

It should be noted that the owner of other people's opportunities to work, because he holds title to the means of their life, willingly consents to call his subjects "sturdy sons of toil," "freemen of labor," or similarly agreeable names, instead of the truthful "industrial slaves" or "economic serfs." And he is entirely willing to let them also apply the more "tactful" titles to themselves.

The owner's unconcern as to such designations is amply warranted by his enviable advantage over the slaveholder "before the war." The latter took care of his property in the bodies and labor-capacity of his Negroes when they were sick, and sheltered them when too old for efficient service. Whereas the industrial and economic master now needs only to plead "hard times," and "necessity for drastic economy," to justify him, at least in his own and his fellow-masters' eyes, in turning his serfs into the streets to join the increasing Army of the Unemployed and lengthening breadlines.

Thereupon it is alleged to be not the masters' fault if starvation or even suicide is the result, when fathers of families can no longer endure their children's cry for food in a land actually overstocked with nourishing foodstuffs, but now iniquitously blockaded from reaching them at all, by the prevailing economic and social (or, rather, anti-social) system.

Under that system, which is still, with rare protests, accepted by the churches, most congregations are composed (of course in varying proportions), of owners and owned. And these are as surely segregated by invisible class barriers, as if the industrial and economic serfs still had to keep rigorously inside an allotted gallery or transept in each edifice. This, no matter how graciously the masters may now and then admit their dependents to share their pews, or how indignantly the owned ones may repudiate any reminder that they are essentially never permitted to overstep their invisible but most real boundaries.

As yet no one has suggested any effective way to abolish the slave galleries in church buildings, except for the owned ones (assisted, it is to be hoped, by the farther-seeing owners), at long last to develop solidarity and intelligent daring enough to change the economic and industrial master-and-slave system *outside* the church walls, into one in which no man can any longer acquire ownership of his fellow man's life and destiny. For it is in our time being ever more clearly revealed that those who are permitted to "own" in perpetuity, by legalized yet never righteous or just means, the earth, the land, and all its contained resources of humanity's very existence, together with the machines and other derivatives from that primal source of supply, do inevitably thereby become dominant slavemasters over their dispossessed and pillaged fellow men.

And surely so long as the purpose of the Creator—to bestow upon *all* the children of men, with none omitted, and not merely upon an exclusive few, the land and all its treasures—continues to be defied, the results of such offense are as surely social unrest and pain as are the agonizing burns on a child's hand which in spite of all warnings of his elders he has deliberately thrust against hot metal.

Does not this then adequately account for the slave galleries, invisible (except in All Saints', Henry Street, New York City) but always indisputably real, in every church where the owners assemble to worship a God of righteousness, in company with those whom they have evicted by man-made law from their divine heritage? For thereby they have constituted these dispossessed "brethen" their essentially owned and enslaved petitioners for the elemental right to be employed at all and to labor in the sweat of their brows for simple food, clothing, and shelter.

So broadly educated and experienced an observer of men and affairs as the Episcopal bishop quoted earlier in this article cannot of course be unacquainted with social psychology. How then can he fail to adduce one of the basic principles of that science, to account for what in one of his sermons he specially deplored—"The absence of the so-called masses" from Church services? Which principle is that the more self-respecting and realistic in outlook an individual is, the more abhorrent he or she finds it to pretend that economic and social barriers do not exist when they undeniably and humiliatingly do.

Manacles on the limbs of a slave are clumsy, and much diminish his capacity of profit-producing labor, besides offending the cultured sensibilities of his owner.

*Episcopal clergyman, formerly assistant-rector of Grace Church, New York. *Editor.*

Non-clanking, even though "gilt-edged," bonds such as can be compactly stowed away from sight in a safe-deposit vault are far more convenient and seemly. And what is more important, they give the owner surer authority to appropriate for his own untoiling use, part of the wealth produced by every one of the so unostentatiously yet effectively owned workers.

To urge the ministry to bring a church that fails to expose, condemn, and help abolish such economic and industrial slave driving, into "closer contact with the masses," is scarcely better advised than to urge drovers to bring distinguished wolves into closer contact with flocks of sheep. Only now the "sheep," with effective aid from a few within all the churches, are men and women fast becoming alert, determined, and no longer decoyable.

It follows also (and more and more of the workers are coming to realize it) that if the holder of the ownership-end of the engraved-paper fetters can by inheritance or any other de-laborized method of acquisition, gather enough of them into his or her "strong box" (so helpful an auxiliary to physically feeble hands) that shackler can live and eat luxuriously, and be clothed as goldenly as Tut-ankh-amen or Zenobia at the climax of splendor; and that without need of rendering to the community in return one unselfish thought or productive contribution of brain or hands, from birthday to decease.

In addition to bonds ("gilt-edged" or others) as a means of keeping the larger portion of modern communities in unseen but most real servitude to the smaller portion, there are also the equally efficient *stocks*.

The workers claim that it is more than a coincidence that the humiliating device which in former days held a culprit with hands and feet clamped in grotesque position before the gaze of passersby, was also called "the stocks." Because although the paper certificates of privilege, which adroitly siphon off most of the workers' product into the pockets of those who merely need to hold fast to those same pieces of engraved paper, are so much less conspicuous, they also nevertheless do their effective parts in keeping the non-owners gyved hand and foot.

No matter how much longer postponed, by all the plausible but nevertheless empty threats which the anxious holders of so-called "securities" can bring to bear, instead of plain answers to inquiries by the workers, it seems now a mere question of time before they will witness a social and economic change so drastic that even the "Daughters" of a former Revolution, who abhor the very reality from which their sisterhood is named, may recognize the stirring aspect of a new and greater "Mother."

That change is accelerated by each awakening of more of the workers, who are seeing through the methods of the big Sleight-of-hand Performer known as the Capitalist System. He will need more cleverness than he has shown up to this time, if he is to continue inveigling them into surrendering enough of their wealth-production to masters who need not work at all, to yield the latter incomes, according to government tax-reports, even as high as the incredible financial "Mount Everest" of $5,000,000 per year.

He himself is coming to realize, ever more inescapably, that he cannot much longer conceal from the workers, that "bonds" are always bonds, and that the "stocks" which now invisibly but nonetheless tenaciously hold them as victims of gigantic legalized exploitation, are always intolerably stocks.

The increasing numbers of the workers who have determinedly thought their way through all the smoke-screens spread by Capitalism and frightened Privilege, and have attained clear insight into economic and industrial realities, exclaim:

"If these are the methods that enable a few members of the human family to hold the rest in yet more effective bondage than former slaveries, let us expose and, with as little strife and enmity as possible, abolish them! We must band ourselves firmly together to assure all workers (by hand, brain, and heart) the full product of their labor. We must not stop short of eradicating all mere unproductive 'ownership,' because thereby the idle are still enabled to live in ease and even luxury, upon the workers."

So resolve the more thoughtful and clear-visioned producers of the world's wealth, rightly applying to the whole of modern society the rigorous and never-superseded command which the Apostle Paul gave his Thessalonian converts, that, "if any would not work, neither should he eat." These will be the terminators of the present confiscation by a few of the treasures that God bestowed upon *all* His children, with not the weakest among them thrust out from such sacred inheritance.

But these will never occupy the slave galleries in the churches. They cherish honorable pride and self-respect, and are as keenly aware of the economic and social barriers between owners and owned, as if over a railed-off section of a church were hung the sign "Slave pews."

No, this portion of the "so-called masses" (and it is increasing in numbers) will remain absent, until all the slave galleries are done away with. And that can be only by entirely casting out of our human society the unrighteous and ruining privilege of private ownership of that which the Creator gave to all.

In short, "the absence of the so-called masses" from our places of corporate worship, deplored by the preacher already quoted, is a wholesome sign that they want the truth more than evasive geniality, justice before specious excuses, and fearless information instead of piously-worded misguidance on controversial issues. And that they will not sacrifice their self-respect by accepting, least of all in an institution alleged to be seeking the truth that makes men free, any claim that when economically and industrially-owned persons sit or kneel in churchly nearness to their masters, they will thereby be emancipated from their essential serfdom.

Indeed, the "absent masses" are finding it ever more intolerable that in decisive tests the Church is so often found to be obediently and even militantly on the side of the master class against the struggles of the workers. And this although it was from the ranks of the workers that the Leader himself appeared whose name the Church bears, and who was loyal to their fellowship and sought the reclamation even of utter outcasts from "social standing," though it cost him at the last his supreme sacrifice.

The only possible conclusion is that if the Church would make the present critical situation its opportunity for a spiritual victory, it must now completely cease to compromise, or any longer halt between two opinions. To continue such general endorsement as at present of the rule of economic and industrial masters, whose days of false "ownership" of the peoples' neces-

sities are numbered, means involvement in the approaching collapse of that domination.

To choose now, when there is hazard and zest in the choosing, the cause of the ownership and control by all the people (including the present masters become brotherly co-workers) of the God-given property of all, —the land and its entire resources, machines and all other means of public wealth—this is the only path out of the morasses of failure to the sun-bathed granite heights of spiritual success.

Surely the ministers of every church must see that if the abolition of such anti-social wrong made possible the return of this now alienated part of the masses, its members would bring to all the churches the very sort of living stones for walls and buttresses, towers and finials, that the unseen Builder himself has always sought.

Will they come? Not until preachers and the churches for whom they speak lay the ax more resolutely than they have as yet, to the root of the corrupt tree of Privilege. They must not stop short of this root-deep cutting. But that has meaning and thoroughness that instantly alarm the beneficiaries of the usurped private ownership of the people's means of life. The word for such preaching and action is "Radical"! Those who undertake it must count the cost. It is the sterner call. But nothing less will now avail.

Fair warning must be given that such truth-revealing would certainly involve the loss of contributions from most, if not all, of the largest donors to the building of cathedrals or other costly edifices that bishops or other leaders are furthering.

But if the proclaiming of radical truth about legalized robbery of the "so-called masses" by a few, who bestow part of their spoil upon ecclesiastical buildings, should result in halting work upon them entirely for a time, the net gain would be great. For another kind of edifice, quarried from the gleaming ledges of truth and righteousness, would soon begin to rise, though at first beyond sight, and in it would be administered the sacrament of that coming Brotherhood now sorely hindered by churchly obsequiousness to generous plunderers.

Then with the classless society free at last from masters and serfs, riders and ridden, there could be undertaken with enthusiasm at present impossible the completion of the honorably delayed cathedrals and other shrines, with no longer any need to incorporate the slave galleries, now, invisibly but no less inevitably, being provided in every one of them.

The American Constitution and Liberalism

VICTOR S. YARROS

The Constitution of the United States, when drafted and adopted, was a great liberal document. John Morley defined that term as respect for human personality. Others have defined it as respect for personal liberty. Historically, of course, the liberal parties everywhere have stood for self-government, for "home rule," for a free church within a free state, for the right to form trade unions, for national self-determination, for freedom to criticize the government. Jefferson was a liberal, and the Declaration of Independence is pervaded and animated by the spirit of liberalism. Lincoln was a liberal when he affirmed that no man was fit to govern another man, or that human rights were more important than property rights. Woodrow Wilson was a liberal when he demanded "the new freedom" in industry and fought monopoly and special privilege. The American anti-imperialists, whether Republican or Democratic by party affiliation, including Senator George F. Hoar and Benjamin Harrison, were liberals when they demanded either autonomy for the Philippines or else the extension of the Constitution, in full vigor, to the archipelago.

In short, despite minor differences, all genuine liberals have, for two centuries or more, worked and fought for human liberty, in politics as well as in economics; for equal opportunity; for respect for human dignity and human personality.

From this point of view, then, let us ask whether or not the Constitution of the United States is a liberal instrument. Can the answer be in doubt? Hardly.

The preamble explicitly declares that the Constitution was being ordained in order to secure the blessings of liberty to the people, among other important objectives. One of these was the promotion of the general welfare. Here are liberal doctrines and liberal purposes. And the government thus established, in the words of Washington, was "completely free in its principles" and was the offspring of the people's choice—resting *on the consent of the governed*. A free, sovereign people, opposed to every form of tyranny and slavery, was adopting a form of government designed to perpetuate popular freedom and popular rule. Nothing, in those days, could possibly be more advanced, more liberal.

In the body of the Constitution, we find the provision for the distribution of governmental power as a means of preventing undue concentration of such power; the provision for reserving to the people all powers not delegated to the United States or prohibited to the States; the provision against the suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, save in certain emergencies; and the provisions safeguarding the rights of the States. All these are liberal provisions logically deducible from the basic principles of liberalism—faith in the individual and respect for personality.

It is scarcely necessary to argue that the Bill of Rights or the first Ten Amendments were all liberal in spirit and in substance. Each of them protects the people and all individuals against unwarranted and despotic infringement of freedom. Even persons charged with crime are accorded ample protection. Truly, victories for human personality!

It may not be quite as clear that most of the later amendments are also the products of the spirit of liberalism. But a little reflection shows this to be indisputably true. The suffrage amendment was a recognition of the political rights and duties of women—a liberal doctrine. The income-tax amendment was in line with the liberal principle, taxation based on ability to pay, or equality of burden. The amendment for the direct election of United States Senators was an attempt to secure better and more independent representation of the States in the Senate, as well as to free the State Legislatures from embarrassing and time-consuming functions that interfered with their proper duties. The so-called anti-lame duck amendment, sponsored by

Senator Norris of Nebraska, was designed to improve the work of Congress and make legislation more responsive to the popular will as expressed in election results.

The Prohibition Amendment was an ill-advised departure from liberalism, but well-intentioned, since it was hoped that it would make for economy, efficiency and national health and welfare. The repeal of that amendment was dictated by sad experience and by proof that violation of personal liberty may be carried too far, and nullification thus invited on a large scale. Liberalism was vindicated.

Altogether, then, the Constitution is a thoroughly liberal and humanitarian document. If certain serious difficulties have arisen in recent years, they are attributable to economic and technological changes, to maladjustments in industry, to the growth of monopoly in the field of interstate commerce, to state impotence, to corporate power. The States cannot adequately regulate the trusts, combinations, holding companies, and monopolies in this field, and the federal government alone would be equal to that task. The question as to whether the Constitution will have to be amended in order to enable the federal government to control and regulate the new, gigantic interstate utilities or corporations, or whether a wholly reasonable reinterpretation of certain vague terms and phrases in the Constitution —due process of law, for example—would be sufficient to that indispensable end, is the highly controversial issue now under nation-wide discussion. Liberals are not agreed upon this issue, but *all* liberals favor effective control of monopoly and public utilities and the prevention of abuses in the fields of industry, commerce, banking, and investment. Liberalism is not static, dogmatic or rigid. It evolves with human needs and conditions. It does not insist upon an outworn slogan, "Let alone." It demands protection for the individual against the private monopoly, the fanatical, narrow-minded pressure group, as well as against a too tyrannical government. It appeals, as it always has, to first principles—and it regards the full development of the individual, mentally and morally, as the highest *social* good. It refuses to worship an absolute, mystical State. It clings to the traditional values of rational ethics and rational religion. It works for genuine democracy and genuine liberty—ends in no way incompatible with the common good and with justice to all. The American Constitution *has been* amended to serve liberalism and progress, and if it is to be amended further, the purpose should still be the enlightened promotion of the same civilized and humane ends.

The rights of the individual and of the minority must be preserved. Majority rule must be limited, as now. Religion, science, philosophy, the arts must be safeguarded against the intolerance and bigotry of majorities. The States may have to be replaced—as some suggest—by *regional* units more representative of economic, geographic, and climatic factors, but centralization will remain a danger and an evil *beyond certain points.* Local autonomy, home rule, decentralization in government are essential to democracy, to freedom, and to progress. The ideal of an omnipotent State, of the State as the sole owner and employer of labor, is repugnant to liberals, and the "proletarian" state is quite as objectionable as the plutocratic or the aristocratic State.

Let us not forget that a constitution *is* a social contract. As such, it is necessarily a compromise, or series of compromises. Conflicting interests must be reconciled somehow and domestic peace and tranquillity assured. We complain of the pressure groups, the lobbies, the vested interests, the opposition to policies and statutes deemed essential to the national welfare, but democratic, constitutional government does not *create* these conflicts and divisions; it merely gives them the freedom and opportunity to agitate and peaceably express themselves. Economic and technological changes require, and sooner or later bring about, political and constitutional changes. Readjustments are due, indeed overdue. Let us make them by peaceful and democratic means. If we fail to do so, revolution will make them—and make them *poorly* and at great cost.

The Study Table

Wells' Latest

THE HOLY TERROR. *By H. G. Wells. New York: Simon & Schuster. $2.75.*

A strange word of warning has to be spoken about this book, and that is not to get bored or discouraged in reading it. It is something like a new era in the Wellsian literature when a reader may be tempted to lay a volume aside as uninteresting, but this happens to be true in this case. The opening fifty pages or more promise well. Then come two hundred pages when the author writes badly, handles his material awkwardly, and seems altogether uncertain of his purpose. How Mr. Wells kept himself going during this portion of his story is a mystery! But beginning with Chapter the Second of Book Three, "The High Tide of the Mutiny," the book comes alive again. There is no lack of excitement, or of meaning in these last two hundred pages. It is the old Wells at work at his appointed task of building the new world.

The Holy Terror is, in our opinion, among the poorer works of the master. Mr. Wells is growing old or getting tired, or else his material is now so familiar and his methods so trite that not even the Wellsian magic can work successfully any longer. This book belongs definitely with *The World Set Free, The World of William Clissold, The Shape of Things To Come,* even *Mr. Britling Sees It Through,* and *The Research Magnificent* type of novel. But one only has to compare it with any one of these masterpieces to see how low the succession has now fallen. Take the last meditative chapter of this book, for example, and place it side by side with the last chapter of *Mr. Britling,* and note the difference. The latter is dictated by profound feeling and unfailing inspiration, the former by routine and rote. Mr. Wells is repeating himself, and doing it poorly. These latest works from his pen—*Brynhild, Apropos of Dolores,* and *The Holy Terror*—remind one for all the world by the latest numbers of the Waverley Novels series. Only Scott was more successful in keeping his inward fires burning!

The Holy Terror has an idea, a somewhat new

idea, or rather, perhaps, an odd turn of an old idea, suggested by the events of the last few years of world history. Hitherto, Mr. Wells has seen his new world of order and decency and common sense springing out of some final, intolerable disaster of arms. Sometimes, as in *The World Set Free,* he conceives some great genius of infinite wisdom and compassion taking hold of the wreckage of mankind and building the Utopia of his dreams. Sometimes, as in *The Shape of Things To Come,* he conceives of humanity plunged into a chaos out of which it is able to emerge, by a slow process of self-recovery, only after a prolonged period of darkness. In this book, Wells shows himself obsessed with the phenomenon of the Dictator, the wild Terror of violence and bloodshed, who in the persons of such men as Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, has suddenly taken possession of our world. Is it not possible, queries Mr. Wells, that we may have to pass through a dictatorship period, ending at last in an ultimate dictator, a "Master of the World," a kind of universal Hitler, before we can attain our permanent and peaceful world order? May not the world conquest and the world rule of such a man be the necessary intermediate step toward our goal?

Wells answers his own question by imagining just such a dictator—an Englishman, Rudolf Whitlow, known in his great days simply as Rud. A "holy terror" in the nursery, a spoiled child at school known as "The Stink," a morose college student with frustrated ambitions and yearning passions for predominance, Rud gathers around him discontented spirits, some of them far abler than himself, but all of them lacking his sense of opportunity, his intuition of leadership, his ruthless drive toward the fulfilment of his desires. In the confusion of the '30s, he organizes his following into a group, or party; and then, by methods never made exactly clear, seizes control of Europe, and ultimately of the world, amid the stupendous chaos of the next war. Subduing mankind to his supreme control, like Caesar in ancient Rome, or Hitler in modern Germany, Rud establishes order, banishes war, wipes out nationalisms and tribalisms of every description, releases across the erased frontiers of old-time nations universal forces of education and enlightenment, ends political corruption and economic exploitation, and thus miraculously brings in the glad new day of which men have dreamed so long. Rud does not do all this himself! The miracle is wrought by the scientists, the engineers, the technicians, whom Rud instinctively gathers about himself, and who thus fill the void created by his bloody triumphs of arms. But there is tyranny at the heart of all this, which finally threatens its own undoing. Rud becomes obsessed with his own egotism, and at last is assassinated by one of his own comrades to save the vast achievement from destruction at the hands of its own maker. But the work has been done; with Rud's death the dictatorship dissolves; and man at last is free. It all seems to be a kind of bewildering fulfilment of Lenin's idea, to which Wells refers in his text, of the state withering up after a socialized politics, industry, and culture, imposed by despotism upon the race, have become the settled order of the world.

Rud is a combination of Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin. In his personal characteristics, he is obviously built predominantly upon the pattern of the Nazi "Fuehrer." But this latest and last dictator moves in a realm from which the petty parochialisms and ideological manias of these contemporary men are altogether removed. It would seem as though Wells had followed the example of the modern newspaper proprietor who combines various newspapers by "preserving the best features of each." But the "best features" of the dictators seem dim, and in the end Rud becomes the perfect master.

Yet out of the work of such a man, by some strange alchemy of the several devotions of unselfish scientists and seers laboring at his dictation and in a spirit utterly alien to his own, Wells would have us believe the brave, new world is coming! It is all very contradictory and confused. On the one hand, we are made to see with terrifying clarity the sure inner degeneracy of the dictatorship principle. On the other hand, we are asked to believe that this same dictatorship may remake and save the world before it is too late. This reviewer, a lifelong admirer of Wells, must confess that he remains unconvinced. A deliberate attempt to reconcile the totalitarian state with the concept of Utopia gets us nowhere. It is a contradiction, not a reconciliation—like Wells' perpetually unresolved dilemma of aristocracy and democracy. Yet out of it all, nonetheless, there springs a hope, a faith, perhaps a prophecy, which time may vindicate—that even the terrors and agencies of this dread hour may in the end be not in vain! It was no less a man than Isaiah who declared that "the day of the Lord cometh cruel both with wrath and fierce anger."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

New Testament Theologies

THE RELIGION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Ernest William Parsons. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.*

Professor Parsons of the Department of New Testament at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School has written an important book. It is in response to repeated requests of his students that he present in permanent form the lectures which have proved inspiring and helpful to the classes who have sat at his feet. The book will also meet with warm approval, and provide needed stimulus to many teachers and ministers who have not had the rare privilege of hearing Professor Parsons in his own classroom.

Professor Parsons entitled his book *The Religion of the New Testament,* but the table of contents shows that he is correctly dealing with the "religions" of the New Testament. He first discusses "the religion of Jesus," then in order "the religion of the Pre-Pauline Christians," "the religion of Paul," "the religion of the Synoptic Gospels," "the religion of the Epistle to the Hebrews," "the religion of the Apocalypse," "the religion of the Fourth Gospel," and that of "the remaining documents." Thus, we have a new presentation of what used to be called "New Testament Theology." The new arrangement is in accord with the historical consciousness of present-day scholarship. When once an historical sense is acquired, and it can be easily acquired from this book, problems that have baffled conscientious seekers will disappear. The New Testament is the outgrowth of the religion of the Prophets and Jesus. Many ideas first encountered in the New Testament, however, grew up during the intertestamental period. Some scholar should write a popular and scholarly book tracing these developments. Professor Parsons clearly points to the influence of the Prophets, but he has little to say about the intertestamental period. Gradually theologians are coming to see the necessity of this too

long-neglected literature. The religion of the intertestamental literature preceded directly and forcibly the religion of the New Testament.

One of the most important features of this study is that the author lets the various books speak for themselves, and in this manner the experience of the early Christian groups is recreated. This is important. Too often books about the New Testament have simply been reading into the past the experiences of the present. But the object of any historical study should be to find the experience lying behind the written documents. What was the experience of Jesus that called forth the memoirs, which we call Gospels?

Professor Parsons, as has already been said, finds Jesus in the line of the Prophets. This cannot be insisted upon too often. But Jesus, Professor Parsons finds, has the eschatological attitude toward the Kingdom which he expected to come suddenly and soon. At this point there must be difference of opinion, since the sources are open to more than one interpretation. It was the Apostle Paul who interpreted Jesus' death on the cross in terms of atonement, the author believes. But again the sources may be read in support of the other view. All this, however, makes the book more stimulating and provocative of serious theological thinking which the American churches greatly need.

This book should be studied by all laymen who want to understand the greatest religious literature of the world; it should be pondered by all teachers and preachers whose task it is to interpret the literature that made our modern world.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

The W.P.A. Theatre

Editor of UNITY:

Your editorial on the W.P.A. Theatre sounds like the statement of someone miles from New York, who had never seen a W.P.A. production. . .

The estimate of the "Living Newspaper" is one of the most unjust and lack-visioned things I've ever come across. "One Third of a Nation" pleased Mrs. Roosevelt, and is credited with deepening Mr. Roosevelt's interest in and work for housing legislation. I took a conservative friend and he was amazed and delighted not alone at the substance, but also at the technique employed. "It is too short," he concluded; and he said the same of the "Living Newspaper," which he put with the finest things he'd seen in two years. We would both testify that there was not any "farcical contempt." It showed up selfish, greedy, exploiting types to the queen's taste.

You say the W.P.A. Theatre "dramatized current events in the spirit of radicalism." Why shouldn't it? Liberalism has failed pretty generally. Ibsen says the liberal is the worst foe of progress.

To speak thus of the W.P.A. Theatre in the light of the vicious sensationalism and general mediocrity of the Broadway productions of several years past, rather than to credit it with fundamental excellencies, as the keenest and best critics have done all along, is a tragic mistake. To call the courage and intelligence displayed, not to speak of the originality, as "running wild" is an astoundingly untrue assertion. And to call the mean-spiritedness, ignorance, selfishness and lack of public spirit of Congressional woodenheads in smashing the project the fault of the directors who have acted wisely and against tremendous obstacles, with very limited funds, is outrageous, it seems to me. And I really know what I am talking about!

BLANCHE WATSON.

New York City.

[Note: It is curious, and ever discouraging, to note how persistently readers will read editorial utterances not in the light of what the editor has said at all, but blindly in the light of their own prejudices and predilections. Would one ever imagine, for example, that the editorial above denounced was a tribute in praise of the W.P.A. Theatre, a lament over its demise, and an attempt to analyze and assess responsibility for what we feelingly described as "a calamity," and again as "a tragedy."

We said that the W.P.A. Theatre Project was "something new in the history of America—the entrance of the government into the field of art." We acclaimed "the venture" as something out of which "might well have sprung a National Theatre such as has long glorified France and other European countries." We referred to the actors and stagehands "now abandoned." But we went on to say that, just because the Project was new, indeed revolutionary in its implications for America, it required the most careful and tactful management. Millions of conservative people, many of them blindly hating Mr. Roosevelt and all his works, were just waiting for an excuse to rend him and destroy his works. And the directors of the W.P.A. Theatre Project gave them just what they were looking for in staging plays of a radical character in the hour of heated and hateful political controversy. Instantly the cry of "Red" was raised—and the Theatre was done for! The excellence of the plays in question, from the standpoint of writing and production, was all that Miss Watson says. But this has nothing to do with the question which we were discussing. We wanted that Federal Theatre Project to continue—and months ago we saw that this was being made impossible by the directors and managers themselves. Gosh, what asininity!—*Editor.*]

The Reverend Mr. Eddy Replies

Editor of UNITY:

May I venture a criticism of the Editorial "A Prayer That Meant Something" which appeared in a recent issue of your magazine?

On the numerous occasions on which I have offered prayer before either house of the Wisconsin Legislature, and once I recall before the House in Des Moines, Iowa, practically a full attendance of the chamber was present on every occasion and stood respectfully during the invocation. Most of the ministers of my acquaintance offer prayers before the Legislature, as elsewhere, of ability, sincerity, and discernment.

The senators on the much publicized occasion were not for the most part "mad" or angry. They were amused or disgusted at one irascible member who under personal privilege took exception to the prayer and hoped the particular minister would not be invited into the presence "of decent men" again. The chief clerk, out of deference to the irate party leader placed a "do not call" after the name of the minister in question. Two senators introduced a resolution that Mr. Eddy be invited to return to offer prayer before this body "soon and at this session." The resolution was referred to committee.

The matter of fee is inconsequential both because of its small amount and because of the attitude expressed in an action of the Ministerial Association some years ago that the members were willing to inconvenience themselves to come down and offer prayer but preferred that there be no compensation lest anyone should think there was a mercenary quality in the service. The matter of the small fee offered does not enter into the thought of either the ministers or the senators.

By and large, public officials are average folks, "as good and as bad as I," or you. There are bound to be a few who are more or less corrupt, many who are scarcely competent for their responsibilities, some who are capable, sincere, and the salt of the earth, as I well know from personal acquaintance.

The senators took a field day off from their really difficult labors for a period of personal repartee under their immunity privileges. The ministers took the sportsmanlike stand that they had no objection to being censured but would not stand for being censored. The Lieutenant-Governor has announced that the offending minister is on the list and will be called again in due course. The net result has been a nation-wide stimulus to an interest in public morality, a deepening concern that public prayers shall be significant, though not always and necessarily prayers of wrath, and an assertion of the spiritual independence of the ministry.

A. L. EDDY.

Irrelevant Foreign Tags and Quarrels

Editor of UNITY:

What is all this nonsense about Trotskyism *vs.* Stalinism in American professional and labor organizations? Why all these angry recriminations and exchanges of epithets and insults? Liberals and radicals are dividing and subdividing themselves on issues that have no relevance to, and no significance for, American problems and American dangers. What is the matter with them? Why are they thus playing into the hands of the fanatical reactionaries?

The simple truth is that we Americans know very little about the merits of the controversy, *in Russia,* between the Stalinites and the Trotskyites. We should suspend judgment, therefore, concerning that controversy and devote ourselves to our own tasks. What is an American Stalinite, pray, apart from his opinion on a question that is purely Russian? Can it be alleged that Stalinites in America favor intolerance, totalitarianism, personal tyranny, and savage treatment of all opposition at home, and that for that reason they are undesirable and impossible? If this is what the self-styled anti-Stalinites imply, then let them ask themselves whether the Trotskyites are, or were when they had power in Russia, more reasonable, more patient with opponents, less arbitrary and less vindictive? Would a Trotsky government at Moscow today free the press and the forum, permit the organization of a legal political party, or several parties, and establish truly democratic and constitutional rule? Hardly, is the answer. Well, then, *to us* in America, what is the difference between Stalinism and Trotskyism?

We do not like any kind of totalitarianism, but we know, and assert daily, that if war breaks out in Europe and we take sides—as we are certain to do, sooner or later—totalitarianism will "happen here," and we shall lose many of our cherished liberties. Why not, then, unite to fight totalitarian tendencies here, and preserve our liberties even if war comes? Let us forget Russia and make up our minds regarding the ways and means of defeating Fascism here, and of safeguarding civil rights and intellectual freedom under any system likely to supersede a bankrupt capitalism. Collectivism in some form seems to be inevitable, but collectivism *can* be limited to the economic realm and kept out of all cultural and moral fields. Those who insist that it cannot, so far at least, have offered no proof, no argument worthy of the name. Defeatism for liberals and radicals spells aid and comfort to plutocracy and economic autocracy.

To repeat: the hatreds and antagonisms generated by the feud between American Stalinites and American anti-Stalinites are deplorable and irrational. They have no justification whatever on our soil. We should work to bring about more and closer coöperation in liberal and radical circles, instead of emphasizing disagreements and fomenting strife. The United Front is possible, provided we put away malice, spite, meanness, and suspicion, and lay down fair and sensible terms for friendly coöperation in politics, in education, and in economic relations.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

Chicago, Illinois.

PEACE FILMS

After overcoming various obstacles, Dr. Francis S. Onderdonk has succeeded in obtaining from Paris a talking film describing the humanitarian work conducted successfully by the League of Nations—its Health Center at Singapore, which also protects our Pacific Coast from epidemics; its combatting of opium traffic, etc. These facts are almost completely unknown to the American public, even to that section interested in current events.

For further information regarding this film, together with others dealing with the World War, Ethiopia, Spain, China, etc., communicate with:

Dr. Francis S. Onderdonk
1331 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 2)

right of collective action to safeguard their interests as industrial workers seek through their labor unions. The same thrilling spirit of democracy, the same determination to have a voice in their own economic destinies, runs through both the organized labor and organized farmer movements.

Furthermore, many of the alleged conflicts of interest between farmers and industrial workers rest upon assumptions which are without foundation. There are, of course, wide differences in the economic status of farmers and also in the relations of large scale farmers and employed labor. Doubtless the position of those farmers who own their own land is more analogous to that of the small business man than to that of the industrial worker. Nevertheless, the recent report of the National Resources Committee showed that the median family incomes of farmers and of wage-earners are not far apart and that the incomes of both are lower than those of all other occupations listed.

It has also been revealed by competent research that farmers' incomes and factory payrolls rise and fall together. While there is need of a just balance of prices of farm products and manufactured goods, there would be little necessity of restricting farm products if the masses of the city and industrial workers received sufficient real incomes to enable them to purchase all the food and clothing needed by their families.

One of the hopeful signs of the times is the fact that labor and farmers are discovering that they are consumers as well as producers. They are finding in the consumers' coöperative movement significant common ground with increasing benefits to both farmers and city workers. The freer exchange of farm and industrial products through consumers' coöperation offers at once a more abundant economic life to both groups and brings them together in what Dr. Toyohiko Kagawa has called a system of economic brotherhood.

We would point out again that the basic need, not only of farmers and labor, but of all economic groups, including employers and consumers, is to develop a broad understanding, a sympathetic attitude, a mutual loyalty, and a spirit of confidence and good will. The soundness of these fundamental principles of Christian brotherhood affords the only sure basis for democracy and offers the only hope of the economic adjustments necessary to a practical and material solution of the problems which now confront us.

With this vital spirit of brotherhood and determined good will, all economic groups will be able effectively to deal with such basic violations of brotherhood and good economics as enforced unemployment, which falls with tragic effect on both rural and urban youth. Until unemployment is abolished and economic life is stabilized on high levels of production and just distribution, there remains a danger to our democratic institutions. Until unemployment is abolished, there can exist neither a sound economic order nor a Christian brotherhood.

In conclusion, we remind the church that if nations, races, industry, labor and farmers are to find a true basis of Christion democracy, it is her responsibility and privilege to sound in this hour the clarion call of brotherhood and lead mankind out of its present strife into the fellowship of Jesus Christ.—*Zions Herald.*

Food for Thought

The following two jokes, whispered around in the Nazi Reich, show that the "happy" Germans living under their dictator may have plenty of speeches but not enough food. The underground humor also reveals that Hitler's slaves refuse to accept the food shortage meekly but have their own ideas about it.

Are You Agitating?

Woman Shopper: I want some sausage.

Grocer: We have no sausage.

Woman Shopper: Well, then, give me a pound of butter.

Grocer: No butter today.

Woman Shopper: Dear me, sell me some onions then.

Grocer: Lady, are you shopping or are you agitating?

All You Have To Do

The town wit to gloomy citizens of Berlin: There's plenty of coffee. Any store will give you a pound free if you buy two pounds of butter and a dozen eggs. All you have to do is find a store with that much butter and eggs.